

## REMARKS

### Requirement for Election of Species

The February 21, 2007 Office Action requires the election of a single disclosed species. The Examiner defines three different species: (1) the method of Claims 1-18, (2) the method of Claims 19-25 and (3) the method of Claims 26-34.

The Examiner has not, however, provided any rationale for why these embodiments are distinct, other than a statement that the claims recite different steps for each method. Applicant submits that this is not a sufficient rationale for restriction, insofar as there is no discussion or support for how or why those differences have patentable significance. Applicant further notes that Claim 1 (Group I) subsumes the claims of Group 3, insofar as each step of Claim 26 falls within steps of Claim 1. Moreover, the Examiner has not provided a rationale for why searching all of the claims would create an undue burden. Accordingly, Applicant traverses the election of species requirement.

### Election of Sub-Species

Applicant hereby elects Species 1 (Claims 1-18). The Office Action further requires election of the elastomer employed and a thermoplastic resin. Applicant hereby elects the fluorocarbon elastomers of Claim 2, and thermoplastic resins of Claim 11.

### Conclusion


Applicant submits that a complete and responsive reply to the election of species has been made and that all pending claims are patentable. If the Examiner believes that personal

communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: March 21, 2007

By:



David L. Suter, Reg. No. 30,692

Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

Correspondence Address:

**CUSTOMER NO. 29293**  
Freudenberg-NOK General Partnership  
Legal Department  
47690 East Anchor Court  
Plymouth, MI 48170-2455  
Direct Line: (734) 354-5445  
Facsimile: (734) 451-1445